REMARKS

Claim 2 has been amended. Claim 8 has been added. Support for Claims 2 and 8 can be found in Tables 1 and 2 on pages 14 and 18, respectively. Claims 2, 5 and 6 have been amended to expressly recite formula (I). Thus, no new matter has been added. Upon entry of this amendment, which is respectively requested, Claims 1-8 will be pending.

Response to Rejection Under § 103

Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,807,994 to Westermann et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,194,210 to Lommerts et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that Westermann and Lommerts fail to render obvious the present claims.

A key feature of the present invention, as stated in paragraphs [0020] to [0023] of the original specification, is that when using a polyketone fiber cord having a high elasticity and a high loss, it is required that the coating rubber have an appropriately high elasticity and low loss in order to obtain a rubberized fiber material having a considerably excellent rigidity balance of polyketone fibers/rubber and loss characteristic.

Lommerts does not disclose or suggest that it is necessary to use the coating rubber having a given modulus at 100% elongation and a given rebound resilience when using the polyketone fiber cord having a high elasticity and a high loss, as recited in the present claims.

Further, Table 2 of Westermann merely discloses a rubber composition having a modulus of 5.3 MPa and a rebound resilience of 64% and does not disclose the use of the polyketone fiber cord, which is a specific cord having a high elasticity and a high loss.

In addition, as shown in each of the Examples of Tables 1 and 2 of the present invention, and recited in amended Claim 2 and new Claim 8, the coating rubber has a rubber component which consists of only 100% natural rubber, while the rubber shown in Examples A-E of Table 1 of Westermann consists of mixed rubbers containing 80% natural rubber. More specifically, Westermann discloses that the rubber component used contains two critical rubber ingredients. *See,* col. 1, lines 41-43 and col. 3, lines 27-31. Thus, the rubber component disclosed in Westermann cannot consist of 100% natural rubber. Indeed, the disclosure at col. 1, lines 41-43 and col. 3, lines 27-31 teaches away from the use of 100% natural rubber as presently recited.

Furthermore, each of M_{100} and rebound resilience in the coating rubber shown in the working Examples of Tables 1 and 2 of the present invention, as disclosed in paragraphs [0047] to [0049], etc, is changed by changing the amount of carbon black HAF.

In contrast, the working Examples of Table 1 of Westermann do not disclose changing each of M_{100} and rebound resilience in the coating rubber by changing the amount of carbon black HAF.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to render obvious the present invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 17, 2008